1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	STATE OF WASHINGTON KING COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT		
9	III.10 0001111	Ser Emon Cocki	
10	STATE OF WASHINGTON,	NO.	
11	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE	
12	v.	AND OTHER RELIEF UNDER THE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT,	
13	FORM GIANT, LLC., also known as	CHAPTER 19.86 RCW	
14	change-my-address.com and Change My Address, an Ohio Limited		
15	Liability Company; and MATTHEW		
16	DAVID RILEY, individually and on behalf of his marital community, as		
17	the President of Form Giant, LLC.,		
18	Defendants.		
19	COMES NOW PLAINTIFF, State of Washington, by and through its attorneys		
20	Robert W. Ferguson, Attorney General, and Paula L. Selis, Assistant Attorney General, and		
21	brings this action against Defendants named herein, alleging as follows on information and		
22 23	belief:		
$\begin{bmatrix} 25 \\ 24 \end{bmatrix}$	///		
24 25	///		
26			
20			

1	3.2. When consumers perform a Google search online for address changing services,
2	the first search result that is displayed on the search engine page is Defendants' business. The
3	result is prominently placed at the top of the page because Defendants pay Google to do so, as
4	part of its Adwords program that permits advertisers to pay for higher placement in search
5	results. Accordingly, when consumers search using the phrase "change my address," they see
6	Defendants' advertisement posted first. Their posting appears directly above the official USPS
7	Official Address Change web site posting on the search engine results.
8	3.3 Defendants' advertisement is captioned in a hypertext link as follows: "USPS®
9	Change Of Address-change-my-address.com' with Defendants' website listed below the
10	hypertext. Below the website listing, Defendants advertise: "USPS® Change of Address Form.
11	Fast and Secure Mail Forwarding." They then list their services in individual hypertext links
12	
13	as follows: "USPS Change of Address Online," "Fast & Secure Mail Forwarding," "Get \$500 in Valuable Coupons," "Secure COA Form." See Figure 1 below:
14	in variable Coupons, Secure COA Form. See Figure 1 below.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

Figure 1 https://www.google.com/search?q=change+my+address&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8&aq=t&rls=org.mozilla:en-US:official&client=firefox-a July 24, 2013.

3.4 Consumers click on Defendants' hypertext link to reach Defendants' web site, in many cases believing that it is the official site for the USPS change of address service. Defendants' web site landing page contains a form requesting information about the consumer's current address and forwarding information. The only disclosure about the price of any services rendered by Defendants is a reference on the top of the landing page to the fact that "There is a one dollar processing fee charged by the USPS® for submitting an online address change request that must be paid with a valid debit or credit card."

11

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	
2]
3	
4	j
5	
6	1
7	
8]
9]
10	,
11]
12	
13]
14	
15	ľ
16	
17	
18	
18 19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

https://www.change-my-address.com, July 24, 2013. There is no other reference to the price of Defendants' services.

3.5 When the consumer has filled out the appropriate address and forwarding information, and clicks on the "continue" button to complete the transaction, he or she is taken to a page requesting payment information. During the period beginning in approximately February 2013 to at least July 24, 2013, Defendants programmed the payment information page so that it loaded onto the consumer's computer screen automatically scrolled down to the middle of the page where the credit card information was requested. The source code of the web page reveals that Defendants included a JavaScript function that ran when the page was loaded. This function commanded the page to appear on the consumer's screen automatically scrolled down to the point below the price disclosures that were made at the top of the page. Accordingly, the consumer saw the page without any indication of the actual price of Defendants' services or the payment amount that was being authorized. Figure 2 is an example of the payment page as it appeared to the consumer:

3.6 Defendants obscured the top of the payment page which, if manually scrolled up to by the consumer, revealed the following: "To prevent fraudulent address changes and to cover the cost of processing and handling, you authorize us to charge your credit or debit card a one-time \$19.95 fee."

IV. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION—FAILURE TO DISCLOSE MATERIAL FACTS

4.1 Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1.1 through 3.6 and incorporates them as if fully set forth herein.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- **4.2** At all times material to this lawsuit, Defendants failed to adequately disclose the material fact that the consumer's credit or debit card would be charged \$19.95 for their services. They obscured the cost of their services by coding their payment web page so that the consumer could not see the amount that would be charged.
- 4.3 They furthered their scheme by creating the impression that the cost of services would be limited to the charge assessed by the USPS for address changes. The most prominent disclosure on their web site regarding the cost of service is at the top of their landing page. This disclosure states that the consumer will be assessed "a one dollar processing fee charged by the USPS® for submitting an online address change request that must be paid with a valid debit or credit card." In fact, USPS does charge one dollar for processing an online address change if a consumer makes the change directly on its official web site. However, given that this was the only clear disclosure made about pricing on Defendants' web site, many consumers accordingly believed that they would only be charged \$1.00 for Defendants' services. The consumer was informed of the \$19.95 charge only when he or she ultimately received a credit or debit card billing statement.
- **4.4** In addition to failing to disclose the cost of their services during Defendants' sales transaction, Defendants failed to disclose the cost in any sales summary at the end of the transaction or in any sales confirmation. The email confirmation that was sent to consumers lists no amount of purchase, but merely confirms the information the consumer has filled in on Defendants' form, and states that the consumer's change of address will be processed.
- **4.5** Defendants' practices, as described in paragraphs 4.1 through 4.4 constitute unfair and deceptive acts and practices in trade or commerce and unfair methods of competition in violation of RCW 19.86, the Consumer Protection Act.

V. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION—UNFAIR AND DECEPTIVE REFUND AND CANCELLATION PRACTICES

- **5.1** Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1.1 through 4.5 and incorporates them as if fully set forth herein.
- 5.2 When consumers contact Defendants about the unauthorized \$19.95 charge appearing on their credit card statements, Defendants offer them a partial refund that has ranged from \$5.00 to \$10.00. Defendants' refund policy, which is disclosed on their website, states that they "will offer a partial refund to any member who wishes to cancel within the first 10 days. A refund of \$10.00 will be processed upon request by calling 1-800-208-1966. We cannot provide a full refund due to the costs already expended in connection with the membership, USPS® change of address process, and partner procurement costs." https://www.change-my-address.com/Legal.aspx, July 24, 2013. Despite the fact that consumers have not authorized the \$19.95 charge to their accounts, Defendants refuse to provide full refunds. Even in instances where the consumer contacts Defendants within minutes of purchasing services in order to cancel, Defendants refuse to provide a full refund.
- 5.3 When consumers call Defendants' toll-free number in order to complain about the unauthorized \$19.95 charge, in many instances they are put on hold for long periods of time that can last up to several hours. In other instances, the toll-free number is not answered at all. Other times consumers reach a recording that requests that they leave a message to which Defendants will respond within one day. Many consumers who leave messages do not receive any response, despite having left multiple messages. Some consumers who have actually reached Defendants' representatives have been disconnected or the representative has hung up on them.

5.4 Defendants' practices, as described in paragraphs 5.1 through 5.3 constitute unfair and deceptive acts and practices in trade or commerce and unfair methods of competition in violation of RCW 19.86, the Consumer Protection Act.

VI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, STATE OF WASHINGTON, prays that this Court grant the following relief:

- **6.1** That the Court adjudge and decree that Defendants have engaged in the conduct complained of herein.
- 6.2 That the Court adjudge and decree that the conduct complained of in Paragraphs 3.1 through 5.4 constitutes unfair or deceptive acts or practices and unfair methods of competition in violation of the Consumer Protection Act, Chapter 19.86 RCW.
- 6.3 That the Court issue a permanent injunction enjoining and restraining Defendants and their representatives, successors, assigns, officers, agents, servants, employees, and all other persons acting or claiming to act for, on behalf of, or in active concert or participation with Defendants from continuing or engaging in the unlawful conduct complained of herein.
- **6.4** That the Court assess civil penalties, pursuant to RCW 19.86.140, of up to two thousand dollars (\$2,000.00) per violation against Defendants for each and every violation of RCW 19.86.020 caused by the conduct complained of herein.
- **6.5** That the Court make such orders pursuant to RCW 19.86.080 as it deems appropriate to provide for restitution to consumers of money or property acquired by Defendants as a result of the conduct complained of herein.

1			
2	6.6 That the Court make such orders pursuant to RCW 19.86.080 to provide		
3	that plaintiff, State of Washington, have and recover from Defendants the costs of this		
4	action, including reasonable attorney's fees.		
	6.7 That the Court order such other relief as it may deem just and proper to		
5	fully and effectively dissipate the effects of the conduct complained of herein, or which		
6	may otherwise seem proper to the Court.		
7			
8	DATED this day of November, 2013.		
9			
10	Presented by:		
11			
12	ROBERT W. FERGUSON		
13	Attorney General		
14			
15			
16	PAULA SELIS, WSBA #12823 Senior Counsel		
17	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
18	State of Washington		
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
23 24			
25			
26			